

### **REMARKS**

The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response to the outstanding Action. By this Amendment, claims 1, 7 and 9-12 have been amended and claims 13 and 14 have been added to further clarify and set forth the application. No new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are now pending and therefore submitted for consideration.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

It is noted that the allowability of claim 2 has been withdrawn based on newly cited art.

#### **Claim Objection**

**Claim 9 has been objected to as containing a typographical error.**

In response, claim 9 has been amended to change the term "careen" to "screen" as requested by the outstanding Action.

#### **Claim Rejections**

**Claims 1, 3-6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tosaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,312,335 B1, hereinafter "*Tosaki*") in view of Uemura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,521,020, hereinafter "*Uemura*").**

The reasons set forth in this rejection with respect to claims 1 and 3-6 are purported to be the same as those set forth in the previous Office Action dated January 28, 2003.

In view of the Examiner's remarks as set forth on pages 6 and 7 of the outstanding Action, and even assuming that the Examiner can use impermissible hindsight gleaned from the claimed invention to selectively combine **Tosaki** and **Uemura** as purported, it is still not clear how one skilled in the art can reach a conclusion that **Uemura**, which teaches circuits and switches (i.e., game processor) within a game machine main body 2 (i.e., single housing), when combined with **Tosaki**, which teaches a casting rod with a separate external game processor 2 (i.e., single housing), can allegedly yield a game processor inside the casting rod instead of, e.g., having just external game processor connected to a display as taught by **Tosaki** and **Uemura**, individually or in combination (taken as a whole). Indeed, the outstanding Action has acknowledged that **Tosaki** actually teaches away from such structure of having a processor inside the casting rod by specifically stating that **Tosaki's** "game processor for determining casting distance is provided external to the simulated fishing rod".

It is also noted that the casting rod as set forth the claimed applicaiton is not comprised of just a single housing as purported by the Examiner (see Fig. 3 showing at least two housings 30 and 50).

As to claim 7, the outstanding Action failed to provide any reason for rejecting claim 7. It is noted that claim 7, which has a different claim scope relative to claim 1, was added subsequent to the prior Office Action dated January 28, 2003, and therefore was

not addressed by the prior Office Action and the rejection thereof cannot be “maintained” from the prior Office Action as purported by the outstanding Action.

Nonetheless, it is respectfully submitted that by amending claims 1 and 7 to clarify that the casting rod is comprised of first and second housings and that the processor is in the first housing, claims 1, 3-6 and 7 are now further distinguished from ***Tosaki*** and ***Uemura***, individually or in combination.

**Claims 2 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tosaki* in view of *Uemura*, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Goschy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,545,661 B1, hereinafter “*Goschy*”).**

Claims 2 and 8 depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, and therefore are allowable over ***Tosaki*** and ***Uemura*** for least the reasons stated above. Additionally, ***Goschy*** does not supplement for the above-discussed deficiency in ***Tosaki*** and ***Uemura*** regarding the processor residing in one of the two housings of the casting rod, and therefore claims 2 and 8 are also allowable over ***Goschy***.

**Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tosaki* in view of *Uemura*, as applied to claim 7, and further in view of *Dornbusch* (U.S. Patent No. 5,232,223).**

Claim 9 depends from claim 7 and therefore is allowable over ***Tosaki*** and ***Uemura*** for least the reasons stated above. Additionally, ***Dornbusch*** does not supplement for the above-discussed deficiency in ***Tosaki*** and ***Uemura*** regarding the

processor residing in one of the two housings of the casting rod, and therefore claim 9 is also allowable over *Dornbusch*.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-14 recites subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art. Applicants submit that this subject matter is more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unobvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Applicants therefore request that each of claims 1-14 be found allowable, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn, PLLC



Raymond J. Ho  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 41,838

**Customer No.: 004372**

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Tel: (202) 857-6000  
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RJH:elz:klf

TECH/217861.1